



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/564,201

11/20/2006

Abass Razavi

F-877 (31223.00107)

9248

25264 7590 12/10/2008
FINA TECHNOLOGY INC
PO BOX 674412
HOUSTON, TX 77267-4412

EXAMINER

RABAGO, ROBERTO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

1. Claims 11-17, 19, 21-23, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Debras et al. (EP 989140) for the reasons set forth in item 4 of the Office action mailed 4/3/2008, as supplemented below.

An alternative rejection under 35 USC 103 is added herein in view of the amendment to claim 11 that each of the two reactors be a tank reactor. The cited reference example does not state whether the reactors used are tank reactors; however, the method is clearly a slurry process. Accordingly, either tank reactors were used, or official notice is taken that ordinary skilled worker would know to select a tank reactor, because such use amounts to a selection from essentially only two conventional reactor configurations for obtaining polyolefin from a supported metallocene catalyst in a slurry medium: a tank reactor or a loop reactor, each of which would necessarily be used in a "continuously stirred" condition. In the alternative, if applicants can show that the cited example would not reasonably have used a tank reactor and that the ordinary skilled worker would not immediately know to select from such a tiny group of conventional reactors, then selection of a tank reactor would be obvious because such reactors are conventional and applicants have provided no evidence of unexpected results.

2. Claims 20 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Debras et al. (EP 989140) for the reasons set forth in item 6 of the Office action mailed 4/3/2008.

Response to Amendment/Argument

3. Claim 1 has been amended to recite a first polymerization comprising olefin and hydrogen, and a second polymerization comprising olefin and olefin comonomer. The reference example includes ethylene and hydrogen in the first stage, and ethylene and hexene in the second stage. The transitional phrase "comprising" renders all process stages open to additional unspecified components.

Applicant's arguments filed 8/4/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the amended claims differ from the reference in that "the co-reactants are not mixed in the reactors." However, there is nothing in the claims which precludes hydrogen and comonomer together in the same polymerization stage, and therefore applicant's argument is not accepted. Applicant's further discussion of hydrogen bleed is no longer relevant because the language specifying a "first" and "second" co-reactant has been deleted from the claims.

4. Claim 18 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 1796

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberto Rábago whose telephone number is (571) 272-1109. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Roberto Rábago/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1796

RR
December 5, 2008